

To: Michelle K Shouse [mkshouse@usgs.gov]; rin Foresman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA[]
Cc: James S Kuwabara [kuwabara@usgs.gov]
From: Brent R Topping
Sent: Fri 10/28/2011 10:16:18 PM
Subject: Re: Fw: Some context around Toxins Appendix D
<http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es048715f>
<http://www.suscon.org/bpp/index.php>
http://archive.deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta_science_program/publications/sci_news_0711_nrc.html
<http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/index.html>

Michelle and Erin,

Thanks for forwarding along the information. I reviewed the copper and ammonia sections, and I had a few comments. I hope they can be useful to you.

In section D.5.3.1, page D-22, near line 24: During this introduction to copper sources, the urban run-off source, especially from copper in brake pads, should be included. Here's a potential reference:

<http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es048715f>

more info at: <http://www.suscon.org/bpp/index.php> - there's a discussion there of the new state law to reduce copper in brake pads, and many more references if needed.

In section D.5.3.2.1, page D-23, line 31: This sentence "there is potential for increased copper concentrations in Yolo Bypass discharge during the first phases of inundation, which should decrease over time as the copper is flushed out of the soils." ends with a nonspecific declaration. How much time?

Seems likely to be decades. And, how much "flushing" is to be expected since the Yolo Bypass is a wide, shallow basin, and thus not likely to include high-velocity flows for scouring? Or, if they're instead expecting the copper (from mining legacy) to partition into the dissolved phase for transport downstream, wouldn't this also take decades? There is discussion of this expected flushing in other sections as well.

Good luck with your tight deadlines.

Brent Topping
USGS - NRP
345 Middlefield Rd.
Menlo Park, CA 94025
650-329-5527
btopping@usgs.gov

From: Michelle K Shouse/DO/USGS/DOI
To: Brent R Topping/WRD/USGS/DOI@USGS
Cc: James S Kuwabara/WRD/USGS/DOI@USGS
Date: 10/28/2011 01:15 PM
Subject: Fw: Some context around Toxins Appendix D

Hi Brent,

Here is some context for the document you are reviewing.

Thanks again,
mic

~~~~~

Michelle K. Shouse, Biologist  
USGS - Delta Science  
Pacific Southwest Area  
Sacramento, Ca  
916-278-9560 office  
916-261-2958 mobile  
mkshouse@usgs.gov

----- Forwarded by Michelle K Shouse/DO/USGS/DOI on 10/28/2011 01:14 PM -----

From: Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov  
To: arstewar@usgs.gov, krprince@usgs.gov, mhornber@usgs.gov, mkshouse@usgs.gov, mmarvin@usgs.gov, bbergama@usgs.gov, bpeller@usgs.gov, jafleck@usgs.gov, kkuivila@usgs.gov, egreich@usgs.gov, rfujii@usgs.gov, lwindham-myers@usgs.gov  
Date: 10/28/2011 12:49 PM  
Subject: Some context around Toxins Appendix D

Hi Everyone,

I briefly spoke with Roger Fujii a few days ago and promised to send some context information on the piece you are reviewing for us, the Toxins Appendix D. I apologize it is coming so late in your review!! (and for the double posting to you Michelle). I hope the info below is helpful :).

The Toxins Appendix D is part of the "Effects Analysis" in the BDCP. The BDCP is a group of projects (including the "Delta Conveyance" previously known as peripheral canal) that are collectively seeking take of threatened and endangered species under Section 10 of ESA and the state's Natural Communities Conservation Planning Act. ESA Section 10 requires the production of a habitat conservation plan (HCP) and DWR is seeking 50 year permits.

USFWS and NMFS will be asked to adopt the HCP and write these take permits so they have to comply with NEPA by estimating and disclosing impacts of their permit in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). USFWS, NMFS, and BOR (federal lead agencies) are preparing a joint EIS/EIR document with DWR (compliance with CEQA) and it will be used as the information base for ESA and NCCPA permit decisions. The EIS/EIR is considering restoration actions at a programmatic level of information and attempting to evaluate the Delta Conveyance and some other projects at the project level, preparing to build them.

The "toxins appendix" is an appendix to Chapter 5, "The Effects Analysis," in the EIS/EIR which is focused on evaluating the impact of BDCP (new conveyance, pumps, operations, restoration, and other projects) on T & E species. The Toxins Appendix along with other 'technical' appendices is being provided to federal lead (USFWS, BOR, NMFS) and cooperating agencies (EPA & Corps) for early review so that we can provide feedback to DWR and their consultant ICF International. The idea is that this will give DWR and ICF time to improve it prior to the planned release of the Draft EIS in May 2012.

A draft of the "Effects Analysis" prepared by SAIC received a very poor and public review by the National Research Council a few months

ago([http://archive.deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta\\_science\\_program/publications/sci\\_news\\_0711\\_nrc.html](http://archive.deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta_science_program/publications/sci_news_0711_nrc.html)). ICF International was hired by DWR to re-do and improve Chapter 5 The Effects Analysis of the EIS/EIR. Presumably

the toxins appendix is part of that effort, however if you've read it you'll know it retains an amazing potential for improvement.

The turn around time on these administrative drafts is v. short and the review schedule is piecemeal. EPA has to provide our comments to DOI next Tuesday and we have not seen Chapter 5 Effects Analysis, just the appendices.

If folks are still reviewing it and want to give me more comments, I can include them through Tuesday around noon. I'll be submitting them at 2:00 PM.

Thanks again!

Erin

\*\*\*\*\*

Erin Foresman

Environmental Scientist & Policy Coordinator,  
US EPA Region 9 C/O Army Corps of Engineers  
650 Capitol Mall Suite 5-200, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 557 5253, Fax: (916) 930 9506

<http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/index.html>